GOVERNMENT

OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

IN THE MATTER OF:

DEFINITIONS:

1) CLEAR HEIGHT, FLOOR TO | Case No. 05-01

CEILING

2) GLASS, CLEAR AND/OR LOW-

EMISSIVITY

and

TEXT AMENDMENT - DESIGNATING
ADULT DEVELOPMENT CENTERS AS
A USE PERMITTED BY SPECIAL
EXCEPTION OR AS A MATTER OF
RIGHT - 11DCMR

-----+

Thursday, March 31, 2005

| Case No. 04-31

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing convened at 6:30 p.m. Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN Chairperson
ANTHONY J. HOOD Vice Chairperson
JOHN PARSONS Commissioner
KEVIN HILDEBRAND Commissioner
GREGORY JEFFRIES Commissioner

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

CLIFFORD MOY Secretary, Zoning Commission

SHARON SCHELLIN Zoning Specialist

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

ELLEN McCARTHY Deputy Director, Office of

Planning

KAREN THOMAS Office of Planning STEVE COCHRAN Office of Planning

This transcript contains the complete minutes of the public hearing held on Thursday, March 31, 2005.

I-N-D-E-X

1.	Prel	iminary Matters
2.	(1)	No. 04-31 Definitions of Clear Height, Floor to Ceiling, and
	(2)	Glass, Clear and/or Low-Emissivity
	Α.	Steven Cochran Office of Planning
	В.	Persons in Support
		1. Len Harris
3.	Text Deve Per	No. 05-01 Amendment Designating Adult lopment Centers as a Use mitted by Special Exception or a Matter of Right11 DCMR
	Α.	Karen Thomas Office of Planning
	В.	Persons in Opposition
		1. Robert Brannum, ANC 5C
	C.	Commission Questions 46
	D.	Persons in Support
		1. Regina James, ANC 5B0353

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

6:38 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia, for Thursday, March $31^{\rm st}$, 2005.

My name is Carol Mitten, and joining me this evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood, and Commissioners Kevin Hildebrand and John Parsons. We are expecting Commissioner Jeffries shortly.

We have two items for this evening's hearing, and the first is Zoning Commissioner Case Number 04-31. This is a request by the Office of Planning for a Text Amendment to Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations to add definitions of one, clear height, floor to ceiling and two, glass, clear and/or low emissivity.

I hope I said that right. Notice of today's Hearing was published in the D.C. Register on February $4^{\rm th}$, 2005, and copies of the Hearing Announcement are available to you, and are located in the wall bin, near the door.

This portion of the Hearing will be conducted ? I guess the whole Hearing ? will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11

DCMR, Section 3021, and the order of procedure will be as follows.

Preliminary matters, followed by the presentation by the Office of Planning. Reports of other Government Agencies, reports of any ANCs, organizations and persons in supports, organizations and persons in opposition.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this Hearing. Organizations will have five minutes and individuals will have three minutes.

The Commission intends to adhere to these time limits, as strictly as possible, in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time. And the Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations, if necessary, and notes that no time shall be ceded.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. These cards are located on the table near the door. Upon coming forward to speak to the Commission, please give both cards to the Reporter, who is sitting to our right.

Please be advised that this proceeding is being recorded by the Court Reporter and is also being Webcast live. Accordingly, we ask you to refrain from

2 Room. 3 presenting information When the into 4 Commission, please turn on and speak the 5 microphone, first stating your name and home address. When you are finished speaking, please 6 7 turn your microphone off, so that your microphone is 8 no longer picking up sound or background noise. The decision of the Commission in this 9 10 case must be based on the public record. To avoid any 11 appearance to the contrary, the Commission requests 12 that persons present not engage the members of the 13 Commission in conversation during a recess or at any other time. 14 15 Staff will be available throughout the 16 Hearing to discuss any procedural questions, and you 17 can address those to Mrs. Schellin or Mr. Moy. Please turn off all beepers and cell phones, at this time, so 18 as not to disrupt these proceedings. 19 20 We'll now consider any preliminary matters the first case, which relates to 21 related to 22 definitions of clear height and clear and/or low-23 emissivity glass. Are there any preliminary matters? MS. SCHELLIN: No, ma'am, there are not. 24 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, then we'll move

making any disruptive noises or actions in the Hearing

1 right into the presentation by the Office of Planning. MR. COCHRAN: Good evening, Madam Chair. 2 For the record, my name is Steven Cochran of the 3 Office of Planning. The Commission has voted to 4 5 advertise two text amendments that you just described. Clear height, floor to ceiling, is 6 to be defined and clear and/or 7 8 emissivity glass is the second term. With respect to clear height, floor to 9 10 ceiling heights are specified in the Southeast Federal 11 Center overlay and the recently approved Takoma 12 overlay. 13 They are currently advertised for 14 Capitol Gateway overlay, the H Street overlay, and the 15 Mount Vernon Triangle sub-area of the DD. 16 The language for the proposed 17 overlay, and for the Mount Vernon Triangle sub-area, 18 exactly the same as that in the proposed 19 definition. 20 The Office of the Attorney General had 21 suggested and OP agreed that rather than defining the term in every overlay, it would make more sense to 22 23 define clear height once. Then future regulations could simply refer back to that definition. 24 25 The proposed definition does not specify a

particular height, it simply defines how to measure clear height, no matter what the desired clear height may be. It would not apply retroactively to, for instance, the Southeast Federal Center, because that overlay does not refer to clear height.

In the future, however, having floor to ceiling clear height defined in one place, in the regulations, would help to establish consistency among the zoning overlays currently being considered, and would negate the need to redefine the term with new overlays the Commission may consider in the future.

Now with respect to the clear glass definition, several zoning overlays already require the use of clear and/or low emissivity glass on ground floors. However, the term has never been defined, so it has been difficult for the Zoning Administrator to interpret or enforce.

There are several examples of ground-floor glazing within these overlays, especially on U Street, where smoked glass has been used, but it is so dark that it is difficult for anything but neon signs to be seen through the glass.

This near opacity does not promote the kind of retail environment the overlays were meant to stimulate. The definition is taken directly from

1	glazing industry standards. The definition would
2	apply to new overlays that employ the term, and would
3	also apply to new construction and existing overlays
4	where the term is employed.
5	That concludes our testimony. We ask that
6	you, we recommend that you pass what has been
7	advertised, and thank you very much.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.
9	Cochran. Any questions for Mr. Cochran?
LO	(No response.)
L1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And let the record
L2	reflect that we've been joined by Commissioner
L3	Jeffries, as well. Mr. Hildebrand?
L4	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Yes, I have one
L5	question. I notice that, would you consider that fire
L6	protection systems would be covered under plumbing and
L7	mechanical systems?
L8	MR. COCHRAN: Sprinkler systems would be
L9	covered under that, yes.
20	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Okay, so you
21	don't feel there's a need to specifically identify
22	them separate from plumbing and mechanical systems?
23	MR. COCHRAN: I hadn't thought that the
24	need would be there. Certainly, if the Zoning
25	Commission felt the need was appropriate, we would

1	view it as consistent with what was advertised.
2	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: In the case of a, of a
4	finished ceiling that might have some kind of
5	variation in the ceiling height, how would that, that
6	would just get measured from the lowest ?
7	MR. COCHRAN: The lowest part of the
8	ceiling height, from the finished ceiling.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anyone else
10	have questions?
11	(No response.)
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, then we're going
13	to move along. All right, I don't think we have any
14	reports of other Government Agencies. On this we
15	don't, I don't know, I don't think there's, is anyone
16	here from an ANC for the first case, clear glass,
17	clear and low-emissivity glass and ceiling height?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right, then we'll
20	ask for organizations and persons in support. Mr.
21	Harris. And you'll have five whole minutes to make
22	your testimony.
23	(Laughter.)
24	MR. HARRIS: Hello. Hi, my name is Len
25	Harris, I'm past Co-Chair and a member of DCBIA's

11 1 Retail Business Development Committee. And I'm here to read testimony from that Committee in support of 2 Office of Planning's efforts here. 3 The D.C. Building Industry Association is 4 5 comprised of 400 member organizations, representing thousands of individuals involved in all aspects of 6 the building industry in the District of Columbia. 7 8 As further set forth below, DCBIA supports 9 10

the proposed text amendment as one small part of the District's effort to promote retail development in our city.

Ιt has become evident from all the mixed-use developments that have place in this city over the past several years, that it is time that we carefully scrutinize the retail needs in our neighborhoods, in order to improve the retail opportunities there.

Office DCBIA fully supports the of Planning's initiative to define clear height, floor to ceiling, and support the use of glass, clear and/or emissivity, in order to improve the situation and new developments throughout our city.

It is important that the retailers, both local and national, who will be investigating retail expansion, particularly in transit-oriented our

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

development corridors. Understand that we as a city recognize their needs and are trying to address them in a positive fashion.

DCBIA understands that the Office of Planning is proposing clear height, floor to ceiling, on the ground floor of buildings in certain neighborhoods, in order to provide space that is more attractive to potential retail and arts tenants, and that you will allow developers to increase the total building height by the amount equal to the additional ground floor clear height.

So that the developer is still able to develop its property to the full density permitted. We have seen that the adaptive use of warehouses and the redevelopment of other buildings, throughout the country, can provide dramatic ceiling heights.

Sometimes in excess of 20 feet. Retailers use those soaring ceiling heights to create signature spaces. If we look at where attractive and successful retail has located in the District, we find it in old department stores such as Borders in the old Garfinkels building, or H and M in the old Woodward and Lothrop building.

We find Barnes and Noble in an old car showroom in Georgetown. D.C. Coast in the grand,

ground floor of 1401 K Street, or others in new buildings where there is an upgrade change to generate sufficient ground floor ceiling height, such as Barnes and Noble and ESPN Zone on $12^{\rm th}$ Street, N.W.

First floor heights in new developments should not be artificially limited to ten feet, and sometimes even less, due to constraints on commercial building heights.

Ground floor ceiling heights should be high enough to allow a restaurant to successfully install creative lighting, or even a chandelier. An apparel retailer to double or even triple hang merchandise, and have enough height to use fly-in display techniques to showcase that merchandise.

Or a Dry Cleaner to build a carousel which can hold enough product to serve its clientele.

Darkly tinted glass should not be used in retail storefronts.

Clear glass should be encouraged to showcase the retailer's merchandise and attract pedestrians into the shop. We note that the request for increased ground floor retail height is already being incorporated in several pending zoning text amendments for neighborhood commercial areas.

And we recommend that the increased first

floor heights be encouraged in all new developments. In neighborhoods such as Takoma, Columbia Heights, Georgia Avenue-Petworth, Georgia Avenue-Shaw, Howard University, Rhode Island Avenue, from $4^{\rm th}$ to $24^{\rm th}$ Streets, N.E., and $4^{\rm th}$ Street, N.E., one block north and two blocks south of Rhode Island Avenue.

Minnesota-Benning, H Street, from 2^{nd} to 14^{th} Street, Eastern Market, acknowledging their start designation there. The Potomac Avenue Metro and Kennedy Street, from Georgia Avenue and 2^{nd} Street, N.W.

Many of the neighborhoods listed will include transit-oriented development on which the additional ground floor ceiling heights will have an enormous impact.

DCBIA supports the Office of Planning's proposed definitions under consideration by the Zoning Commission in this case. We also respectfully request that the Office of Planning and the Zoning Commission require higher ground floor ceiling heights, only in those locations where it can be accompanied with matter of right. Additional total building height and retail and arts tenants are to be encouraged.

We are excited by what a significant increase in the height of retail and arts spaces can

	mean, and dige you and the office of Fianning to
2	consider the advantages of additional ground floor
3	ceiling height described here, and particularly in the
4	context of transit-oriented developments.
5	Thank you for taking the comments of DCBIA
6	regarding these issues into considerations. Thanks.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any
8	questions for Mr. Harris? Any questions?
9	(No response.)
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We don't take
11	questions from the Office of Planning, Mr. Cochran.
12	(Laughter.)
13	MR. COCHRAN: I just thought that Mr. Mann
14	raised a very good point about the fire suppression
15	systems and it may be appropriate to include that in
16	Section 199.1B, Components of Mechanical, Plumbing, or
17	fire suppression systems.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Do you mean Mr.
19	Hildebrand?
20	(Laughter.)
21	MR. COCHRAN: Yes, I do mean Mr.
22	Hildebrand, I'm so sorry.
23	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: That's okay, I
24	didn't mind being Mr. Mann for a moment.
25	(Laughter.)

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
2	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: One bald guy
3	looks like another.
4	(Laughter.)
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thanks, Mr. Harris,
6	good to see you.
7	MR. HARRIS: Thank you.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: To a guy who has hair,
9	maybe that's true.
10	(Laughter.)
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is there anyone else
12	who would to testify in support in Case Number 04-31?
13	(No response.)
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone in opposition?
15	(No response.)
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right, then, I
17	don't think, since we have no opposition and we have
18	one suggested change, if, Mr. Cochran, would you just
19	read that one more time, for the suggested change?
20	MR. COCHRAN: Components of mechanical,
21	plumbing, or fire suppression systems;.
22	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Madam Chair, can
23	I follow up on one of your questions?
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure.
25	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: And it has to do with

1	the idea of architectural features within ceilings.
2	And I think it's a really valid questions.
3	Is there anything in this text that would
4	preclude you from doing an architectural soffit or
5	beam to delineate spaces within a floor plan, that
6	would then restrict you to measuring the ceiling
7	height to the bottom of the soffit, instead of the
8	bottom of the ceiling?
9	But typically, in an older building, you
10	might have a serious of column lines and grids and
11	even though they are not the structural columns,
12	they're just architectural features that enliven the
13	ceiling plane.
14	MR. COCHRAN: Exactly. And they are
15	architectural features. Anything dropped from the
16	finished ceiling would be permitted under this.
17	The idea was to define the space that is
18	provided by the building owner, independent of how it
19	might be fitted out by Retailer A, that starts in the
20	space, Retailer B, that then takes over the space,
21	etcetera.
22	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: So non-structural
23	soffits ?
24	MR. COCHRAN: Correct.
25	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: ? would be

1	considered allowable to descend below without
2	violating the clear ceiling height?
3	MR. COCHRAN: That's right. We certainly
4	want to permit flexibility, the choice of the
5	retailer.
6	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Thank you.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else?
8	(No response.)
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, well then I
10	would move approval of Case Number 04-31, with the
11	addition of the language in B, to add, or fire
12	suppression systems.
13	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Second.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any
15	discussion?
16	(No response.)
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All those in favor,
18	please say aye. Aye.
19	(Chorus of ayes.)
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I don't believe we
21	have any opposed, Mrs. Schellin?
22	MS. SCHELLIN: Staff will record the vote
23	five to zero to zero, to approve Case Number 04-31, as
24	modified. Commissioner Mitten moving, and, I'm sorry,
25	I did not catch ?
ļ	

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It was commissioner
2	Hildebrand.
3	MS. SCHELLIN: Commissioner Hildebrand
4	seconding. Commissioners Jeffries, Hood and Parsons
5	in favor.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And just
7	so that everyone knows, this will be referred to the
8	National Capital Planning Commission, and then it will
9	be published in the D.C. Register as a proposed rule-
LO	making for a 30-day comment period.
L1	So now we are ready to move to the next
L2	case, which is Case Number 05-01, and this is a
L3	request by the Office of Planning for a text amendment
L4	to the zoning regulations, to allow adult development
L5	centers under the same circumstances as child or
L6	elderly development centers are permitted.
L7	And, as was the case with the previous
L8	hearing, the Notice was published in the D.C. Register
L9	on February 4 th , 2005. And I won't read the whole
20	opening statement again, because the circumstances of
21	the case are the same, and the order of procedure will
22	be same.
23	And, Mr. Hood is reminding me that this
24	was supposed to start at 7:00. So are you ?
25	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll tell you why,

1 Madam Chair. Last week or maybe week before last, we had the same situation. And I think we waited and 2 someone did come in. 3 So I think if we're going to err on the 4 side of caution, we probably want to wait until 7:00. 5 That's just my recommendation. 6 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, well, then what 7 8 I'll do is rather than starting again with the opening statement, we'll just adjourn for five minutes and go 9 10 right into the presentation by the Office of Planning 11 at 7:00. Okay, so we're adjourned for five minutes. 12 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter 13 went off the record at 14 p.m., and went back on the 15 record at 7:00 p.m.) 16 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: We're back the Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. 17 18 read the opening statement for the second case, which 19 is the case that has to do with adult development 20 centers. 21 And I'll just remind folks of a couple of 22 things before we go forward that I had read earlier. 23 Which is that organizations will have five minutes to testify, individuals will have three minutes 24 25 testify.

And anyone who is planning on testifying this evening, needs to fill out two of the witness cards that are on the table in front of us or on the table near the door.

And then before you come forward to speak to the Commission, just give those cards to the Reporter, who is sitting to our right, and then we'll just help you along from there.

So first we will have the presentation by the Office of Planning.

MS. THOMAS: Good evening, Madam Chair, members of the Commission. For the record, I'm Karen Thomas for the Office of Planning.

The Office of Planning is proposing a text amendment to provide for Adult Development Centers within the use classification of Child/Elderly Development Centers, as identified throughout the current zoning regulations.

What led to this request for an amendment was the District Court of Appeals remand of Metro Day Treatment Centers Appeal Case Number 16839, where the D.C. Court of Appeals summarily determined that defined uses may not be interpreted to other uses that are functionally comparable, such as a Day Treatment Center which may be similar, but with respect to the

nature of the use and the impacts of the use on the public.

Therefore, because Metro Day's program was not principally for children or the elderly, the Court of Appeals determined that Metro Day could not qualify as a child or elderly development center, as a matter of law.

And that vacated the Board's Order. As Petitioner, OP's analysis involves a brief review of the programming on day treatment centers as proposed in the revised text, in an effort to determine whether their operations are comparable in use and impact to other facilities in the assigned-use category.

As outlined in our report, a number of existing facilities in the District provide these services to District residents. And their services aim to provide, aim to improve their client's independence and community exposure.

These centers cater to a range of ages, and we also provide services to seniors, who may only need daycare supervision.

Programs include special education counseling, parent training, skill building, crisis intervention and recreational therapy. And may work in conjunction with mental health, recreation and

educational organizations. Based on a common theme expressed in the standard definition, applied by local jurisdictions and the District, as well existing operations, a day treatment program can be incorporated into the programming of the child or adult development center. Or exist as a stand-alone facility for youths as well as adults. Therefore, day treatment

programs, operated by an adult or child development center, may differ based on the age of the client population, but not on the nature of the use.

Similarly, if the nature of the uses are comparable, the impact due to traffic and parking would have a similar effect.

Since the centers provide care and services to individuals who typically do not drive, the parking space requirement should be based on the number of employees and staff, rather than the crossflow area.

The District Department of Transportation also concurred with OP on this determination, and the parking space requirements should be similarly categorized.

These centers are supported throughout the comprehensive plan by many of the ward objectives and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 human service policies. The comp plan ward elements de-institutionalization of clients 2 promote in а setting which would allow participants to 3 reintegrated to fully participate in community life. 4 5 According to information provided by the Department of Human Services, there are approximately 6 7 Medicaid-sponsored service providers 8 District, which provide adult and day treatment programs in a less restricted environment. 9 10 Many of these facilities managed 11 federally-support programs and are designed to provide 12 necessary services for an under-served population. The Office of Planning, in consultation 13 with the Office of the Attorney General and DHS, 14 15 supports the inclusion of adult development centers in 16 the same use category as child or elderly development 17 centers. Since they are comparable with the service 18 functions of existing development facilities in the 19 regardless of the 20 District, ages of the client 21 population. Office of 22 Planning recommends 23 approval of these amendments as outlined in OP's report, and this concludes our testimony. Thank you. 24

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Questions

_	TOT MS. THOMAS: MI. HOOG.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Ms. Thomas, on Page
3	3 of your report of March 31 st . This table here didn't
4	help me.
5	MS. THOMAS: Yes. Yeah, I'd like to point
6	out, a point of clarification on the Residential R-4
7	to R-5 uses. It should read matter of rights/special
8	exception, because for the R-4, in the R-4 zone, it's
9	a matter of right up to 16 persons.
10	And, similarly in the R-A, B and C, it's a
11	matter of right with no more than 16. In the R-5, D
12	and E, it's a matter of right with no more than 25
13	individuals. And after that the special exception
14	process kicks in.
15	So that should read matter of
16	right/special exception.
17	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And as for the R-4,
18	R-5?
19	MS. THOMAS: Yes, that's R-4, R-5.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Now, and this is
21	the way it currently exists for child/elderly, right?
22	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
23	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And let me ask you
24	a question. I know it looks very simple to just add
25	the word adult, but one of the things, when you say

child/elderly, and I don't know if we can talk about the remand, because I don't think that's proper, because I think that's still in front of the BZA. But when you add the word adult, could bring some different impacts. Has that been looked Because when I look at the definitions, we're into? talking about counseling and some other things which

apply to those various ? my issue is counseling.

Because then you start talking about drug treatment and different types of things. Has that been looked at in the Office of Planning's thought process?

MS. THOMAS: Yeah, we looked at, we focused on the day treatment centers which are typically run by these adult and child development centers. And some of the program, a lot of the program, rather, is similar in its function.

They do, for instance, when we had a BZA case with the Darrell Youth Life Learning Center, they had, it was primarily child development, however, they did incorporate some adult in it in the afternoon, and the programming was similar.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I know what we're trying to do here, and maybe I'll let somebody else try, because I'm interested in hearing the comments.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But I'm just wondering if we have really realized the And even though it's the word adult, but 2 impact. 3 there are some other things that come along with it. Because the way I see this, especially 4 5 when you say R-4 and R-5, again, the same old story, it always just ends up in a certain part of the city. 6 And I think that's one of the concerns that, at least 7 8 through the years that I've heard. I don't know how this will impact here, 9 10 but what I'll do is just hold off and wait, because I 11 seems like it's always in a certain, specific area, 12 that these things go on. But anyway. 13 MS. THOMAS: Well, remember it's, in R-4 ad 14 R-5, it can only be in a church up to 16, 16 members. 15 It can only be in church. Otherwise, anything else 16 beyond that, it kicks out into a special exception, as a special exception, plus 17 it's like every other residential zone district. 18 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But I know once you 19 20 number, that then you go into the exception process. 21 22 MS. THOMAS: And also in location, I mean 23 if it's outside of a church. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Outside of 24 а 25 church?

1	MS. THOMAS: Yes.
2	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I just think that
3	there's an impact, and I don't know if we've looked at
4	it. Maybe I just don't understand, but I think
5	there's another, there's a more significant impact
6	with adding the word adult.
7	And maybe we need to re-look at that.
8	But, anyway, I'll wait to see what the conservation is
9	and I'll wait to see what people have to say. Thank
10	you.
11	MS. THOMAS: Sure.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood,
13	Mr. Parsons?
14	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Ms. Thomas, your
15	report, at least the copy I got, did not have the
16	attached listing on the footnote at the bottom of Page
17	7.
18	Maybe we don't need to do that. But I'm
19	trying to understand the magnitude of this. What the
20	narrative says is there's 38 Medicaid-sponsored
21	service providers of these day treatment programs in
22	the District.
23	And how many centers does that result in?
24	Do you know?

MS. THOMAS: Well, the list I, I based it

1 on what the list that was sent to me from DHS, and it was about 38, on that list, I think, one, two, three, 2 3 four ? PARSONS: all of 4 COMMISSIONER So these 5 providers then have one center. There's nobody doing this on a multiple basis with one of these purveyors, 6 7 go ahead, I'm sorry. 8 MS. THOMAS: Repeat the question, sorry. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I now have the 9 10 chart, so that's helpful. But each organization of 11 the 38 that you mentioned, only has one facility, is 12 that correct? 13 MS. THOMAS: Each client, yes, one 14 facility. 15 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So do you anticipate 16 from your research that what we're doing here tonight 17 is going to result in a vast increase in these 18 facilities or, I think that's what Mr. Hood is getting 19 at. 20 we're doing tonight going what 21 result in 100 of these, or is there anyway to predict 22 that? 23 THOMAS: I have no way of predicting MS. that, but when I look at where these facilities are 24 25 located, that they don't seem to have any one area of

range through the District 2 They from northwest to southwest to Wisconsin Avenue to ? they 3 4 don't seem to be located within, you know. 5 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So some of these on the chart appear be in other jurisdictions. 6 to Baltimore, Alexandria, Oxon Hill, Maryland, Bethesda. 7 MS. THOMAS: Some of ? 8 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Is that their home 9 10 office or are these the locations of the facility? 11 MS. THOMAS: These, what I have here is 12 what the District, this is what the District 13 regulates. These are the programs under the District 14 operation. 15 And have applied to the District, to DHS, 16 and have some form of federal, Medicaid funding. 17 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Ah, ha. So this may be the location of the organization, not the facility 18 they are managing? 19 20 MS. THOMAS: Yes, umm hmm, umm hmm. MS. MCCARTHY: If you look at St. Coleta's, 21 22 for example, which is on Page 12, as we know they 23 are, their headquarters are in Alexandria, but they are looking to provide treatment in Washington, within 24 25 the District, yes.

1

concentration.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Parsons, when I look at the list, I see mostly 20018 and 20017. 2 That 3 stands out for me. Just a personal observation. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anything else? 4 5 I wanted to ask a couple of things. One is, the thing that be the distinguishing 6 seems to characteristic for the adults, would be that these 7 8 would be individuals with disabilities, is that 9 correct? MS. THOMAS: All of them, child, adult and 10 11 elderly, cater to individuals with disabilities. 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It doesn't seem to, 13 that doesn't seem to be the case. What it says is, is that the facility ? I'm trying to leave out some of 14 15 the words just to make a clear statement. 16 That the facility would be for a variety 17 Care, education, counseling, training, of of things. 18 individuals 15 years of age or less, that's 19 category. 20 Elderly individuals, that's another Individuals with disabilities would be a 21 22 third category. So it seems like what, the sort of 23 distinguishing characteristic of the adults is that they're individuals with disabilities. 24 25 And that qualifier may or may not apply to

people who are, who would otherwise be considered children or elderly. Is that ? MS. THOMAS: That's correct. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So then I quess the question is what do we mean by individuals with disabilities? So, I mean, because people are, I think there's some concern about, well who exactly are we targeting and what might we be allowing into our neighborhoods, that we're not thinking through entirely. So are these, is there anyway that we can define that better, so that it doesn't include people that we don't expect to be included. Is there, you know, did you draw on any resources from, you know, the mental health community. I don't know who else, the Department of Health, the Department of Human Services, that could give us a better sense of who is in and who is out, when talking about individuals with we're disabilities. MS. THOMAS: When we looked at some of the institutions and some of the programming, for

instance, I do believe if you look at Arlington County

Express, what they did at their treatment center

expresses it will, as well as the definition used by

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 the District for the, for what is, what is typically center, providing 2 adult development the day an treatment. 3 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, well, 5 seems to say in Arlington County is that these are, that their definition of individuals with disabilities 6 are individuals who have physical and/or cognitive 7 8 impairment. 9 MS. THOMAS: As well as in the District, From what DHS, information DHS provided for me, 10 11 it's a major aspect of their programming. 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 13 MS. THOMAS: Programs that are designed for individuals with mental retardation and development 14 15 disabilities. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, I think I have a 16 17 sense of what, how we could possibly narrow that. 18 Here's another question, and this is one of distinctions, maybe, Mr. Hood was trying to get at. 19 20 When we talk about the impact, if we just treat them as we would a child development center or 21 22 an elderly development center, one of the things that we don't expect, typically for, certainly for children 23 and not to any great degree for the elderly, is we 24 25 don't expect the individuals who are being served, to

But we don't know that the same will be 2 3 for adults. true Because they may have 4 impairment, but it may not be such that they can't 5 drive. Ι don't know to what extent 6 So, 7 thought through whether or not the parking 8 requirements were really, should be the same, or there 9 might actually be a greater need for an adult 10 development center for more parking. 11 MS. THOMAS: Well, from talking to DHS, 12 they, they, when we discussed that part of it, they said typically their clients don't really drive there. 13 and 14 They don't have license, you know, other 15 situations, they don't have license. 16 Those who could possibly get around, it's more of an indigent population, if you would. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, so is it because 18 19 they're physically or cognitively impaired or because 20 they are too poor to have a car? 21 not making Because we're an economic 22 distinction here. So do you have a sense of what's 23 driving it or not. Or what's driving the fact that they are not, of what is affecting the fact that 24 25 they're not driving?

1

be driving themselves.

1	MS. THOMAS: Typically it's more
2	handicapped or cognitive impairment.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, okay. Anybody
4	else, questions for Ms. Thomas? Mr. Hildebrand?
5	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Would this
6	definition include people who had a significant
7	psychological difficulty.
8	And I guess my concern is at what, is
9	there any risks associated with this group outside of
10	the facility?
11	MS. THOMAS: I'm not, I don't think I'm ?
12	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Like disturbed as
13	opposed to impaired?
14	MS. THOMAS: I know it addresses the
15	psychologically impaired, but I don't think I'm
16	qualified to determine the risk, in terms of medical
17	evaluation as to the risk.
18	MS. MCCARTHY: I think what they are trying
19	to get at is, is the population that we're looking to
20	serve with this, essentially, people with either
21	developmental disabilities or elderly people who are
22	house-bond and who need activities, you know, or
23	somebody to keep an eye on him, keep him active during
24	the day.
25	But they are not people with serious

1 psychological issues or other impairments that, you know, do we have ? 2 3 There is psychological MS. THOMAS: impairment, but people who are functionally able, but 4 5 they might need help to be integrated into society, you know, to be able to live on their own. 6 7 Teach them skills to how they could live 8 on their own. Like say for those who are not that 9 physically impaired. 10 MS. MCCARTHY: Ιf Ι understand the 11 Commission's questions correctly, you were trying to 12 figure out how to, how to perhaps better define the 13 adult population that we're talking about providing 14 services for, and to distinguish that between, say, 15 clinic services that may have, also have counseling as 16 accessory uses, but, yeah, and it looks like maybe we could do some further research on that and come back 17 to you with some more precise definitions. 18 19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think that would be Anyone, Mr. Jeffries? 20 helpful. 21 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, definitions 22 and perhaps, just for my sake, I just want to get a 23 better handle on just, you know, looking at about, you know, the type of populations that are 24 25 typically going to these centers.

1 And I just want to get a better handle on, 2 just, what percentages of them are, you know, 3 suffering from psychological issues or all physical 4 impairments. 5 I mean, I just want something that would get us comfortable as to the types of populations that 6 we can expect in this new definition. 7 And I think 8 that could be a good driver for us, in terms of 9 getting comfortable with where this is going. 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Hood. 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, if I 12 could just ask the Office of Planning just something support 13 The definition, you don't 14 definition of day treatment being included in the 15 definition. 16 You don't support, ${\tt Ms.}$ Thomas, the 17 definition of day treatment being in the regulation? 18 What I see, according to Page 6? 19 MS. THOMAS: Yes, yes, we do not, I don't, 20 we didn't want to define that. We think it's better 21 defined through the Department of Mental Health. 22 same way that the define what a day treatment program 23 is. That's where we got that definition. It's 24 25 part of their service.

1 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So you would rather leave that out of the definition? 2 THOMAS: Of the zoning regulations, 3 MS. 4 yes. 5 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else? 6 7 (No response.) 8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, I don't think we have reports by any other Government Agencies. 9 Is 10 there any one here ? I know we have some single-member 11 district Commissioners, but is there anyone here 12 actually representing an ANC? 13 have a letter authorizing you 14 represent the ANC? Because we would need that. We'll 15 hear from you, it's just we won't hear from you at 16 this particular time. Okay? We'll hear from you. So now we'll 17 18 take organizations and persons in support. And I have 19 one person who actually checked my witness list as 20 being in support, but we'll have whoever, whoever else 21 might be a proponent to come forward. 22 But I don't see her, Regina James? 23 is there anyone who would like to testify in support, then? 24 25 (No response.)

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, fine, well then
2	we'll move to organizations and persons in opposition,
3	and then I'll just work through the list. Mr. Brannum
4	Ms. Jackson, we're just going to fill up a panel and
5	you can give the cards over to the Reporter.
6	Mr. Knott, Rudolph Knott, and Frank
7	Malone. Okay, we'll start with those three and see
8	where we go from there.
9	So each of you will then have three
10	minutes for testifying as individuals. Mr. Brannum,
11	why don't you go ahead.
12	MR. BRANNUM: Good evening. My name is
13	Robert Brannum, I'm Commissioner 5C04, and I, the ANC
14	5-C did take a vote to have me represent the
15	Commission.
16	Unfortunately, I don't have that
17	Resolution here in front of me, but the ANC, for the
18	record, did oppose the change.
19	And the rationale is that we feel that
20	the, it should remain a special exception, rather than
21	as a matter of right. And we, it would have been
22	helpful to us to have had the statement and position
23	of the Office of Planning, before we had an
24	opportunity to come here.

As a Government Agency, routinely their

positions would be known before we come, but I think that when the Government comes in as a Petitioner, in this instance, that their rationale for what they're presenting, should be made available so that we can, so we're in a better position to understand the rationale for its position.

We don't have that benefit. And some of

We don't have that benefit. And some of the questions that you have, you have because you have the information in front of you.

We, sitting here, we didn't have it before. All we had was the Commission's order or statement saying that it was holding the hearing. So based on the change, as it was presented, we would naturally be opposed to it.

The rationale that was given, that may be given by the Office of Planning, may or may not have affected our position, but it would have been helpful to have had that position before.

And as a Government Agency coming in, it should consider providing that notice to the ANCs along with any proposed rule-making consideration.

One of the issues for me would be the classification definition of adult treatment. I don't think you can say that the adult treatment center has the same, similar characteristics or benefit for a

child.

I don't think that's, that works for me.

The adult treatment development centers can be used for bringing in drug treatment, alcohol treatment, other kinds of services. And Ward 5 is over burdened with those kinds of services.

Not to say they aren't needed, but I think they should come in with the support of the community, with prior notice to the community, rather than have it brought in as a matter of right.

So, the opposition is not to the treatment itself, it's just to how they come in. I think that's the critical point for us. We're not opposing it, we just feel the matter of, how you come into the neighborhood.

My time is up, so I'll leave it there. If we have some more chances, I'll come back.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, we're going to do the whole panel and then we'll ask questions, okay?

Thank you, Commissioner. Would you shut off your microphone, terrific, thank you.

MS. JACKSON: Good afternoon, Zoning Commissioners and other ANCs, fellow citizens of the District and distinguished guests. My name is Enid A. Jackson, I am Ward 5, ANC single-member district 5A09

Commissioner.

I have been a resident of Ward 5 community for other three years. I am here today to testify regarding the proposed text amendment to DCMR 11, designating adult development centers as a use permitted by special exception or as a matter of right.

In my opinion, and in the opinion of many of my constituents, that this proposed text amendment, as currently worded, is wrong and not in the best interest of my community.

Several prevailing questions regarding the amendment, must be answered to my satisfaction before it can earn my support. What are the governing policies and procedures for the operation of an adult development center?

And why is it so hard for ANC Commissioners to obtain information on ADCs? Why is information on the current number of child and senior development centers located per Ward throughout the city, so difficult to obtain.

Does the proposed amendment have a location within a particular radius of another ADC limitation. For example, 100 feet, 200 feet, 500 feet? If not, why not?

Why did the Zoning Commission follow the Office, Counsel's suggestion, may we wish to define the term elderly in order to avoid misinterpretation.

All right. I believe the number of adults covered by the amendment should be limited based on the physical limitations of the adult development center, but should not be open-ended, as in the case in the proposed amended current reading.

The proposed text amendment needs further study and review before it should be seriously considered for passage. There needs to be written assurance in place that guarantees that the placement of these adult development centers, is fairly and equally disbursed throughout all eight Wards of the city.

With provisions made for adequate monitoring checks and balances to ensure that these ADCs operate in full compliance with District zoning and other laws.

The zoning regulation should be amended to include a no sleep over provision, so ADC operations cannot get around that, who are present for less than 24 hours per day, by shuttling clients off the premises for an hour or so during the day.

The current C-2A, zoning restrictions

1 should be maintained for ADCs. An official assessment of the potential traffic and parking impacts ? 2 (Timer sounded.) 3 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You can just go ahead if you only have a couple of more sentences. 5 MS. JACKSON: Okay. Impacts of the ADCs is 6 7 proposed residential targets should be done before 8 acting on the proposed amendment. Simply saying it would be the same as with 9 10 child or elderly development centers, is not good 11 enough. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Commissioners 12 for providing me with the opportunity to share with you the viewpoints of the citizens and residents of 13 14 Ward 5, single-member District 5A09, on this very 15 important and potentially-troubling issue. 16 We hope and trust that you will give serious to 17 considerations some of our concerns regarding this amendment in your deliberations. 18 19 you. 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Commissioner Jackson. Mr. Knott. 21 22 MR. KNOTT: Thank you. I'm Rudolph Knott, 23 Jr., ANC Commissioner for 5A10, and I'm going to take opportunity to voice my opposition 24 25 facilities such as, the so-called treatment centers or

residential-based facilities being established in residential neighborhoods as a matter of right.

My constituents and I feel that these facilities are inundating our communities. I understand the need for treatment and the care for our citizens, but I feel our communities have the right to be informed where and by whom these kinds of establishments are planted in our neighborhoods.

Ιt appears to many of that the us government of the District of Columbia does not have a handle on these facilities as it is. And as the government doesn't seem to be able to provide our constituents with locations of current facilities, how can there be effective oversight ensuring that they do not negatively impact residential neighborhoods.

My Commission, ANC 5A, has recently past a Resolution calling for a Moratorium on any more such facilities in Ward 5, until we can get a city-wide accounting of all establishments of this kind.

I think if we want our citizens to support these establishments, we need to make sure the community has some meaningful input into such proposals.

We must ensure that Contractors who provide these services, do not do so to the detriment

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Τ	of our communities. Our citizens need to be empowered
2	to effect change if there's negligence on the part of
3	the providers. In order to ensure that the
4	communities are properly notified, and included in
5	future plans, I oppose any changes in regulations that
6	would allow providers to more easily establish
7	facilities, without having to go before the community
8	in forum such as this. Thank you.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you,
10	Commissioner Knott. Questions for this panel? Mr.
11	Hood.
12	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yeah, let me just
13	follow up on Commissioner Brannum. He mentioned, I
14	think your ANC, you did, actually I believe, I'm not
15	sure where we're going, but we may be able to get that
16	from your ANC.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The Resolution?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yeah, we would like to
20	have the Resolution submitted, if you could get us a
21	written copy.
22	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But let me ask you,
23	you said you all voted in opposition to the word adult
24	being in the definition, I mean to the word adult
25	being added as a matter of right into the definition.

1 Did I understand that correctly? CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: When you respond, turn 2 3 on your microphone, thank you. MR. BRANNUM: We oppose the, we oppose the 4 5 inclusion of adult, and also the inclusion as a matter of right. 6 7 Well, VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: there's 8 obviously an issue in Ward 5, and it's good to see so many Ward 5 people. But I would say, it's obviously 9 10 there is an issue, because I see quite a few Ward 5 11 folks here. 12 Commissioner Knott and Commissioner 13 Jackson, would you also agree with Commissioner 14 Brannum, even though I know he is in 5C and you two 15 are in 5A, would you agree with his statement about 16 the word adult? And I don't know if you heard our question 17 That was a concern of some of us, I know the 18 up here. 19 Chair, myself and others may have had. But you also 20 stated the word adult in this definition. 21 along with child and elderly, 22 which may cause a potential problem or issue. Am I 23 If you want to turn your microphones on just correct? so I can make sure we get it on the record. 24 25 MR. KNOTT: Yes.

MS. JACKSON: Yes.

VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's a good yes or no question, thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. I did want to comment on a few things. First, to Commissioner Brannum. I understand completely that you, it would have been more desirable to have the OP report in advance.

And the reason there wasn't more in the file, is because that was a case, this case originated by, as a request from a Zoning Commissioner. So normally it would be initiated by the Office of Planning and they would write a report when it was set down for public hearing.

But it came off the dias, basically. So there wasn't any lengthy set down report outlining the rationale. So this is a kind of unusual circumstance.

So I think there will be additionally opportunity for dialogue on this subject. I wanted to comment, I think, Ms. Jackson, you have a lot of good ideas in your, in your testimony.

And, we, I mean, I think having a certain distance between locations is a good idea. It probably is a good idea to go back and define what elderly means, even though the focus of this is adult.

But, you know, we are constantly trying to refine the ordinance. I also think that your suggestion about cleaning up the language that says that they are there for less than 24 hours a day.

I think that's ripe for somebody to try and figure out a work around, so I think that's a good suggestion. And one of the ? so in terms of asking for some follow up from the Office of Planning, I think these are issues that we would like some additional feedback about.

And one thing that Mr. Knott mentioned, you know, one of the reasons why you're having, that I think you're having difficulty finding out where the facilities are currently located, is because right now they are not called adult daycare centers, that doesn't exist.

So what I would like for the Office of Planning to follow up on with the Zoning Administrator is, if you describe, the reason that this case came forward, and Mr. Parsons, correct me if I'm wrong, that this was a special exception that came to the Board of Zoning Adjustment for this use.

But there may be these uses that are being put into the community that didn't come before the BZA as a special exception, that had been interpreted as a

1 matter of right use by the Zoning Administrator and being called something else. 2 I think we would be very interested to 3 4 know what that something else might be. 5 perhaps, find out where those facilities are located and get a better sense of that. 6 So I think these are, I think these have 7 8 all been good suggestions, and we'll be studying this further, so we hope you'll follow us and continue to 9 10 help us with this. 11 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, can I 12 just add ? Commissioner Knott, if we could get your 13 testimony, hopefully we'll be able to get that at a 14 later date and we can make copies or however, we would 15 appreciate it. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: else 16 Anyone have 17 questions for this panel? Mr. Jeffries? 18 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: You know, I have to say that from time-to-time, you know, I am so much 19 20 more compelled by testimony from those that are, you 21 know, on the streets, so to speak, and who live and 22 work and so forth. 23 And this is one of those instances where I got so much more out of some of the issues here, 24 25 these so-called adult development centers, around

Τ	listening to your testimony, than even reviewing the
2	OP report.
3	And I was sort of wondering, you know, I
4	know in the past we've done roundtables on different
5	things, and I'm not necessarily trying to move back to
6	that, particularly if the Office of Planning can
7	really drill down and really start to educate the
8	Commission.
9	But I just wanted to comment that you've,
10	at least for me, raised my serious awareness to this
11	issue and some of the concerns. And I just want to
12	appreciate, just wanted to let you know that I
13	appreciate your comments.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Okay,
15	before we backtrack and go to persons in support
16	again, anyone else in opposition that would like ?
17	oh, I'm sorry, before you all go ?
18	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Don't leave yet,
19	please.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sorry.
21	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: The current child
22	and elderly centers in Zones R-1 through 3, are by
23	special exception. And in R-4, once you get to 16
24	people it's a special exception.
25	Does that work in your community? That

52 1 existing condition, forget the adult thing, just the child and elderly. I mean when you come here and say 2 this should not be a matter of right, you didn't know 3 that they're not supposed to be a matter of right. 4 5 So I'm trying to figure, ask you if that gives you any comfort, what you heard tonight, about 6 7 these being treated the same as the adult, I mean as 8 the child/elderly centers? 9

MR. BRANNUM: Part of, if I may, Mr. Parsons, part of my comments would have been that they all should be as a special exception, because given a matter of right they come in, and then trying to correct it or go against it, it becomes that much difficult and it becomes after they've already come in, they've set up.

They've incurred financial liabilities or hardships. They've got people coming into the communities. They're claiming they are providing a service, this, that and the other.

But, and we would seem almost like demons saying that children and the elderly shouldn't come into the community. And I don't think any of us feel that services, needed services should not be provided.

But there has to be some kind of recognition that too much can be too much. Because a

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

_	good number of these are praced in creatry residential
2	areas.
3	And it can be disruptive of traffic. It's
4	disruptive for just normal community and neighborhood-
5	ness, and it's not, may not so much be the clients,
6	but the operators of those facilities that don't seem
7	to want to really be sensitive to the concerns and
8	needs of the community.
9	I mean, I mean, there's a triangle in my
10	area that is known for being, ignoring the community.
11	You know, down off of North Capitol, P and New York
12	Avenue. That treatment center, shelter, that triangle
13	is causing havoc in our neighborhood, clearly havoc.
14	So a matter of a special exception would
15	address some of those issues.
16	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thanks. Anyone else?
17	Okay, thanks folks. Anyone else in opposition?
18	Anyone else who'd like to testify in opposition?
19	(No response.)
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, then we'll have
21	Ms. James come forward. You need to push that little
22	button.
23	MS. JAMES: Good evening. My name is
24	Regina James, Advisory Neighborhood Commission for
25	5B03, representing the Brentwood Community.

1 Madam Chair and Zoning Commissioners, I do have testimony. I will bring it down to the office 2 3 I'm going to wing it. Hopefully I can remember all that I attempted to type here for this 4 5 evening. I wasn't privy to most 6 information, but I believe that 7 colleaques 8 support of special exception. Special exception provides notice to the community. 9 10 gives that notice to the ANC/SMD 11 Commissioner and the Commission. If the Commission is 12 dysfunctional, then you have the community can rely on their ANC Commissioner to get that information out. 13 14 Not only to the citizens, the civic and 15 the concerned resident groups that our 16 community, because we do have Commissioners in our 17 Commission that are not actively involved. They are, actively involved in their SMDs. 18 19 They're not fully representing their community. Ι 20 would not like to see the community penalized because 21 of this type of dysfunction. So I think if you provide the ANC/SMD 22 23 Commissioner notice, that they could at least get that information out to the various citizens, civic and 24

associations, so they could represent their case.

Because, as in Ward 5, we were here, I
think, 2003. Our communities are being inundated with
groups homes, which come in as a matter of right and
under federal regulation.

Then we have community-based residential
facilities. Then we have what appears to be child,
adult and elderly day centers. I don't have a
problem. I don't want to beat up on the children and

I don't have a problem with the word adult. Because some, when I think of adult, I'm thinking of the mentally challenged or people that have nervous and mental disorders.

But it does need to be defined, in that, what do you deem as adult. Because it could be a methadone, it could be a methadone program that comes in, under the auspices of daycare treatment.

And with the communities already being inundated, it would just provide the community notice for those Commissioners that are actively engaged to whatever circumstances that arise from these type of facilities.

Because we're not notified of the group homes. Anything that falls up under special exception, the Office of Zoning is good about

the elderly.

1 notifying, not only the Commission, but the ANC/SMD Commissioner. 2 So, with that, I would be in support of 3 special exception. But, as I state, I will submit my 4 5 testimony, because I did provide it. And I've indicated a number of questions 6 7 that I would like for you to consider. In that the, 8 because R-1A is the most restricted, if that zoning district is the most restricted, then everything else 9 under it falls, we're all privy to. 10 11 So notice should be given to the 12 community, in that, and I think, as Commissioner Jackson stated, we need to find out if we have one 13 14 here, are we going to have one two or three house 15 down. 16 You know, so we need to check the aerial 17 radius of how far are we going to set these things 18 apart. Because as one Commissioner, а 19 Commissioner, had indicated, he had seven group homes 20 in one block. 21 And they all had problems. In that, I'm 22 providing my community information, in that they can 23 attack the federal funding. You can go after the funding if these people are not managing 24 their 25 properties sufficiently.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to wrap it up
2	now.
3	MS. JAMES: Okay. And you wouldn't want to
4	put a vulnerable population in a community where there
5	is, where we seriously have crime problems. Thank
6	you. And I will bring the testimony down tomorrow.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any
8	questions for Ms. James, before she goes? Mr. Hood.
9	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Just one quick
10	question, Ms. James. I don't know if you heard
11	Commissioner Brannum, and I'm trying to make sure
12	we're all on the same page. You're listed as a
13	proponent.
14	MS. JAMES: A proponent?
15	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: A proponent of what
16	was proposed, I think, on the ?
17	MS. JAMES: Yeah, I support ?
18	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You support ?
19	MS. JAMES: As special exception.
20	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So you would
21	support the comments. I think your were here when
22	Commissioner Brannum mentioned about the adult, the
23	notification. That's basically the issue, let me cut
24	to the chase.
25	MS. JAMES: Right, right.

	58
1	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Having notification
2	throughout, with the exception of, because it's a
3	special exception already as it exists as child and
4	elderly in R-1 to R-3.
5	MS. JAMES: Right.
6	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And then it's a
7	matter of right/special exception, what I was informed
8	by Office of Planning, in the R-4 to R-5. Matter of
9	right/special exception.
10	But you would like to see it as a special
11	exception.
12	MS. JAMES: All of it as a special
13	exception. Because it provides ?
14	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: With adult only,
15	with the word adult only.
16	MS. JAMES: Well, I don't have a problem
17	with the word adult. First you have to define adult,
18	because people that are mentally challenged do not
19	really present a problem in the community.
20	People with nervous and mental disorders,
21	generally do not provide a problem within the
22	community. But if you're going to consider those
23	people in a community, first you need to look at the
24	public safety concerns of that area.
	I and the second

You wouldn't want to put a vulnerable

1 population inside a community that is already stressed. 2 VICE 3 CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, 4 unfortunately, you all didn't get the report. 5 Chair stated, it was initiated by another case on the BZA, but the Office of Planning is now recommending, 6 7 not recommending that the term drug treatment center 8 be in the definition. 9 MS. JAMES: Okay. 10 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So I don't know if 11 that eases you some, but I do agree with 12 notification. 13 MS. JAMES: Right. 14 VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: But how we get to 15 that point, I think, there's going to be some serious deliberation. 16 MS. JAMES: Yeah, well, yeah. I heard some 17 of the discussion with regards to adults, but you 18 19 don't want to penalize those adults that have nervous 20 and mental disorders. And I can't think of, people that grow up 21 22 with Down's Syndrome that are able to live outside of 23 their communities. You wouldn't want to penalize those kind of people, if they participate in a day 24 25 treatment center.

1 I think it needs to be, the word adult 2 really needs to be defined. VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, thank you, 3 4 Commissioner James, and it's good to see Ward 5 folks. 5 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yeah, we heard. Thank Anyone else, before we close it out? 6 7 (No response.) 8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I just want to see if I can get a little consensus for some direction before 9 10 we close this out. 11 I think for myself, one change in approach 12 that we need to take is that we need a separate 13 definition of adult development center, instead of 14 trying to glom it together with these others. 15 And then we can, I think it will give us freedom to decide where it should be 16 in the 17 ordinance and whether it should be a matter of right 18 instead of trying to decide these as a, as if they were a cohesive entity. 19 20 Or that they were similar entities, that 21 this will be called out separately and then we can 22 move it around and modify it as necessary. Do we have 23 a consensus about that? Okay. else want 24 So, anyone make any 25 suggestions before we ?

1	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, I
2	think, Ms. Jackson, if we can incorporate that ?
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, definitely.
4	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: She had some very
5	good, well everyone did, but she had some very good
6	specific items that we were talking about of how ?
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The proximity?
8	VICE CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Proximity, thank
9	you. The proximity of these developments. Thank you.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, before we end, can
11	I just get some sense of when the Office of Planning
12	thinks they might be able to get us some additional
13	information and then we can make sure, especially,
14	that that gets circulated to the ANCs in Ward 5, since
15	they've taken a special interest.
16	MS. THOMAS: I'd just like to say that we'd
L7	like some time to really research this.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure.
19	MS. THOMAS: I guess, in the short span of
20	time that we had, we really could not go into a lot of
21	the definitions and uses that day treatment could
22	provide. So I was glad to have this opportunity to
23	listen to the ANCs and voice their concerns, which
24	should be reflected in our report, going forward.

But it would take some time to ?

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just tell us how much you need, I just want to, I just would like to have a 2 3 cutoff, I'm not pressing you. 4 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Excuse me, and I'd 5 just like to get some clarity. Can you just throw back to us what you think some of the questions were 6 7 that we had? 8 MS. MCCARTHY: You mean your original questions or what you're asking us to look at now? 9 10 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: What we're asking you to look at now. 11 12 MS. MCCARTHY: Well, I think the, how to 13 distinguish the various populations for adult centers. 14 And then what kinds of issues might one write in, in terms of proximity, prohibitions against them becoming 15 16 residential facilities, better definitions of that. 17 You know, I think we need to get better 18 information from DCR and DHS about, well, there's Chair Mitten's question about getting with the Zoning 19 20 Administrator and finding out are there many of these 21 that are out there now that are a matter of right and 22 they are simply called community centers or something 23 like that. What would they typically be determined by 24 25 the Zoning Administrator to be? And then talk to DHS

ĺ	63
1	and other District Agencies that might fund these
2	centers and find out the range of programs and just
3	become, I think, more familiar with the kinds of
4	services that are needed, the kinds of services that
5	are provided and how to regulate them effectively.
6	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Thank you, thank
7	you.
8	MS. THOMAS: Just for the record, as well,
9	I'd like to let you guys know that I did ask DHS to
10	come down here to explain a little better some of
11	their programs and their programming for these
12	centers. And, unfortunately, nobody showed up.
13	COMMISSIONER HILDEBRAND: Would you also
14	investigate the idea of parking requirements to see if
15	there's a different calculation or a different count
16	that should be applied here.
17	MS. MCCARTHY: Madam Chair, why don't we
18	say two months to be safe, and we will aim to do it
19	before that time, if that's possible.
20	But, I just now what's on everybody's
21	plate and how long it might take to get some of those
22	answers.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, so let's say no
24	later than June 1?
25	MS. MCCARTHY: Okay.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay? And then we
2	will take it up, take the issue up at one of our
3	regular, monthly meetings after that. And then folks
4	who are interested in following this, we'll probably,
5	we'll probably take the Office of Planning's input and
6	then adapt it, take a vote on it, and then it will be
7	published in the D.C. Register.
8	So there will be another time, another
9	opportunity for you all to comment on what we've done,
10	then we can take those final comments and incorporate
11	that into the final rulemaking.
12	So I hope you all stick with us and help
13	us as we work through this process. And I appreciate
14	you all coming down tonight and this hearing is now
15	adjourned. Thank you.
16	(Whereupon, the proceedings in
17	the above-entitled matter were
18	concluded at 7:58 p.m.)
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	